

Compass Advisory Team Retreat
 Heidel House, Green Lake, WI
 July 10 & 11, 2001

- Participants:
- Joe Hollister - Transportation District 3
 - Jerry Kast - Monroe County
 - John Kinar - Bureau of Highway Operations
 - Gary Kennedy – Manitowoc County
 - Tom Kochanski - Transportation District 2
 - Alison S. Lebwohl - Compass Program Manager
 - Anne Monks - Division of Transportation Districts
 - Mike Ostrenga - Transportation District 8
 - Matt Rauch - Bureau of Highway Operations
 - Scott Schnacky - Bureau of Highway Operations
 - Tom Walther - Eau Claire County
 - Jack Yates - Marquette County
 - John Nordbo - Compass Retreat Facilitator (OODS)
 - Marshall Stivers - Expert Advisor, ICA Director of Maintenance Systems
 - Linda Peart, notes
 - Susan Scheuerell, logistics
 - Don Hartman, videographer

Topic	Discussion & Decisions
THE BIG PICTURE	
Intro to weighting & ranking model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alison distributed a printout of an Excel spreadsheet, illustrating the model. • The Advisory Team will fill in the elements, features and activities, and will fill in & weight the maintenance objectives. • The Standards Team will fill in the percentage of time in each activity contributing to each feature; the percentage which each activity contributes to the maintenance objectives. • This will be used to create a prioritization matrix, and to weight the features and elements. • The team reviewed Florida's 4 maintenance priorities and Washington state's 7. It looked at Wisconsin's activity codes.
Vision & Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alison distributed "Excerpted Notes from May 16, 2001 Meeting with Dave Vieth, John Kinar, Scott Schnacky and Alison on Compass Strategic Planning." • The team agreed with most of the draft Vision. • Strike "We're keeping score. We can benchmark the best performers." Replace it with "I know that I am doing what's expected of me, and doing it right." • Other points raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Everyone involved knows what good performance is; has clear definitions, expectations and priorities." • Should have buy-in from all districts, counties and individuals, regardless of standards and measurements. This should come from having them involved in the program development. • Important to know all the financial trade-offs and implications. • We don't need 100% buy-in. We do need 100% understanding. • Importance of statewide uniformity. • Need for more county involvement in decisions. • Concerns about "bench-marking best performers." We need to stress that this is an opportunity to share what's working across counties. A successful program will capture positive measures; focus on the system, not the workers. • Values discussion:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The team agreed with the draft Compass Values noted on the hand-out sheet: Accountability, Continuous Improvement, Transparency, Communication, Driving out fear, People doing the work know the work, and Customer focus. • Decision making should maximize meaningful involvement by those who will be affected. • Transparency. Importance of including and communicating with the counties and districts. Suggestion that we provide 1-2 page summaries of important meetings, decisions, events. • Need buy-in from executive level managers and supervisors. • Continue conversations with staff and counties.
Overview of customer survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rick Moss distributed copies of the 1999 Highway Ops Customer Satisfaction Survey. • It was noted that plants, grasses and weeds were a low priority for spending, but that they tend to be a high priority for people who live next to the highways. • It was also noted that there are things that are important to us as caretakers of the system that aren't immediately visible to the public, e.g., drainage, tort liability, etc. Marshall noted that in Florida, this program has helped reduce or eliminate claims. • The Bureau will hold off on doing the next survey until it has heard this team's recommendations on what information it would find helpful in shaping this program.
Stakeholder analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders brainstorm list: Tax payers, Adjacent Property Owners, Counties, Front-line State Workers, District Managers, Highway System Users, Elected Officials, Motorists, Municipalities, BHO Management, Business Owners, Road Builders, Commercial Drivers, Trucking Association, Business Interests (Tourism, Industry, Commerce), County Commissioners, Patrol Superintendents, DNR, Police, FHWA, Emergency Government (Ambulances, Wreckers), DOT Secretary, Timber Producers, Salt Haulers, DMV.
SWOT analysis	<p>The number of participant votes follow each. Top three priorities are bolded. All other categories that received votes are in italics.</p> <p><u>STRENGTHS</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accountability, including with Legislature – 10 2. Budget Justification (more \$) – 8 3. Uniformity – Basis for Asset Management – 7 4. <i>Maximize resource usage – 5</i> 5. <i>Clear priorities/expectations – 4</i> 6. <i>Customer satisfaction – 1</i> 7. Record of success in other states – 8. Data-driven decisions 9. Improved communications 10. Better communications with Legislature 11. Public awareness 12. Shows that DOT and Counties do good work – less risk of privatization 13. Measures effectiveness <p><u>WEAKNESSES</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resources to implement/maintain – 12 2. Lack of buy-in – 9 3. Final product doesn't measure efficiencies – 5 4. High level of communication required once program is implemented – 5 5. <i>Difficult to implement – 3</i> 6. <i>"Flavor of the week" perception – 2</i> 7. <i>Could be seen as a method of punishing service providers/counties – 1</i> 8. Could become too complicated 9. Data being collected internally threat of bias – make self look good 10. Data integration (lack thereof) <p><u>OPPORTUNITIES</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased communication leads to increased funding – 8

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Tie service levels to budget \$, at maintenance and operating budget levels – 7 3. Better product/system – 5 4. <i>Better communication – 4</i> 5. <i>Common purpose/focus for all – 4</i> 6. <i>Stakeholder expectations will match money available – 3</i> 7. <i>Link to DTD Resource Model – 2</i> 8. <i>Uniform system management – 1</i> 9. <i>Improved operational procedures – 1</i> 10. Address legal mandates/statutory 11. Learn from others 12. Link to other programs/Divisions <p><u>THREATS</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to get buy-in – 9 2. Fear of being measured – 9 3. Fear of change – 7 4. <i>Too much data – 4</i> 5. <i>Raised expectations of legislators – 2</i> 6. <i>Legislators see this as a cure-all (rather than just a tool) – 2</i> 7. <i>Individual counties have less funding relative to other counties – 2</i> 8. <i>Road Builders could see program as threat to their livelihood – 1</i> 9. <i>Not producing reliable, quality information – 1</i> 10. Something we are doing now will get bumped 11. Program could collapse under its own weight 12. No commitment that this is the way we do business (by Secretary on down) 13. Program perceived as busy work 14. Misunderstanding of roles in this process 15. Fear of standards not being set appropriately 16. Lack of follow-through/commitment 17. Negative results 18. Total failure
Maintenance objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florida uses: Safety, Preservation of Investment, Comfort & Convenience, and Aesthetics. • Washington state uses: Improve safety; Operate systems reliably; Protect our investments; Support the economy; Address legal mandates; Meet environmental responsibilities; and Contribute to comfort & aesthetics. • The team agreed to keep objectives as simple as possible to cover needs; that four objectives seemed like a good start. • Concern: environment and legal. We will try the pilot without these being explicit and then evaluate.
THE DETAILS	
Criteria for Selecting Pilot Locations; Possible Locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented by Joe Hollister and Anne Monks • The initial list of possible criteria included: 1) Interested County Managers/Districts; 2) Different weather types; 3) Variety of road types; 4) Unique areas (strictly rural or urban); 5) whole counties (Milwaukee; high growth rate?); 6) Linear (North vs. South?) • Gary Brunner (District 5 SP & O Manager) submitted the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no more than one county per District (workload) • a large urban area with suburban growth (Fox Valley, Milwaukee or Dane County) • medium sized urban area (Green Bay or Brown County) • smaller urban area (La Crosse, Wausau or MPO area) • heavily traveled tourism routes (I-94, I-39, USH 53 – linear issues) • heavy tourism area (up north) • primarily agricultural

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • primarily rural forestland • The biggest issue in this project is workload for counties; they should not be penalized for participating. If we use 30 - 1/10 mile segments per county, it is estimated it will take two people two days per county for the initial rating. Alison clarified the fact that 30 samples would provide statistically valid data. • Tom Walther feels it is best to have one county employee with one state employee to make up the team doing the ratings; this participation should help a lot to get county buy-in.
Data Gathering and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented by John Kinar, Mike Ostrenga, Jerry Kast, Brian Gaber • Recommendations included: gathering actual data; using normalized number scale for features; measuring standard deviation for features; using grades for elements; and using grades for the system. • John felt gathering actual data will be worth the extra effort, especially for the pilot, and should not be difficult for experienced field people. • Scott mentioned “a picture is worth a thousand words,” as shown in the Paser Manual ratings (for Concrete, Asphalt, and Drainage). • For feature reporting, normalized number scale (0 – 100) was recommended because it emphasizes meeting a target over doing better, regardless of cost, and numbers are more easily compared county to county. This reporting seems more acceptable than grades A – F or percentage passing. • In reporting feature variability, standard deviation with actual data is the recommendation because it gives information about variability as well as average. • For element reporting, grades are recommended since they are more meaningful to the public and the legislature. • For system reporting, again grades are recommended since the public and legislature more easily understand them.
Selecting Activities and Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented by Scott Schnacky and Jack Yates • Recommend using a version of the new activity codes. Need to be able to go from activities to costs, and we have cost data by activity code.
Different Standards and Weights for Each Road Class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented by John Kinar, Tom Walther and Alison Lebwohl • The team recommendation is to have the same standards and weights for different road classes. Include road class information for each segment so we can evaluate how we’re doing by road class on a statewide level. Participants agreed relative weights should not differ; keep the same element weights regardless of road class.
Data for Top of Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented by Matt Rauch and Tom Kochanski • Suggestions included: 1) District; 2) County; 3) Highway Route Number; 4) Photolog Mile Marker Location; 5) Rural or Urban; 6) Type of Roadway; 7) Date Survey was Taken; 8) Adopt-a-Highway Control on Roadway. • Suggested change: show Roadway Class (rather than type). • There should be a way of identifying segments and where sites are, either by reference point or photolog mile marker, but should eventually link to GPS • Other possibilities: Reviewed by; Number of Lanes; Flexible/Rigid; Start/End Place.
THE DECISIONS	
Decide Which Objectives and How to Weight Them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus on Florida’s four, with an eye on legal mandates and environmental concerns. • All participants divided 100 points between the four, then individual scores were averaged. Results: Safety = 45% (Range 40 – 50%); Preservation of Investment = 29% (Range 25 – 40%); Comfort and Convenience = 17% (Range 10 – 20%); Aesthetics = 9% (Range 5 – 10%). The team then agreed to round the numbers to multiples of 5, so that people could easily calculate the relative values. • Decision: maintenance objective weights: Safety = 45%; Preservation of Investment = 30%; Comfort and Convenience = 15%; and Aesthetics = 10%.
Decide on Data Gathering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The team had an extensive discussion on actual data vs. pass/fail. Actual data gives better information on the range of conditions, but there is simplicity in pass-fail. Points raised included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be possible to put a pass-fail screen on actual data to see how rich the data is.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time and training concerns about gathering actual data. Is there was enough value to justify the additional effort? • Gathering actual data allows local managers to be able to compare results of different cycles. • We can do the toughest gathering the first time for the pilot; once we have an accurate handle on pilot data, we can revise and scale back to what is most important, necessary and acceptable. • This exercise could really help field people to understand the highway system better to make roadway maintenance a high priority. • We can gather actual data for the pilot, have checks on checks, then look at inconsistencies to decide what is really necessary for the process to be valid and consistent. Need to have a validity check and information on time required for the effort. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision: Gather actual data for the pilot, then decide what makes sense for the future.
Decision on data reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision: Use normalized number scale for feature reporting. • Decision: Report the standard deviation for each feature on that normalized number scale. • Decision: Use grades for element reporting. • Decision: Use grades (with + and -) for system reporting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will have to be careful about funding decisions based on grading, so bad grades don't necessarily warrant more money. • We will have to make sure communications are good so understanding of grades is gained.
Decision on data for top of report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision: Include: 1) District; 2) County; 3) Highway Number; 4) Photolog Mile Marker Location; 5) Rural or Urban; 6) Roadway Class; 7) Number of Lanes; 8) Flexible/Rigid; 9) Start/End Place; 10) Date (Survey Taken); 11) Reviewed by. • The team discussed definitions of rural and urban. Tom K. agreed to write these up. [Note: Since the STN database included federal definitions of rural and urban, we had these exported to the rating sheets with the other relevant information.] • Ratings process: should mark segment with spray paint ticks to show start and end for QA check. • Segments that include bridges, work zones, or areas about to be reconstructed can be thrown out.
Decision on margin of error	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rather than selecting a given margin of error, the team decided to go with a statistically valid number of samples and see what the standard deviation turned out to be. • Decision: Use 30 - 1/10 mile segments per county.
Decision on weights for road classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision: Use the same standards and weights, regardless of road class.
Decision: Ratings Team members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be good to have a 2-person team, so they can meet at the end to compare ratings and go back over any discrepancies. • With centralized training emphasizing consistency, and a manual to refer to. • One county and one district person. Having a county person involved will help significantly with county buy-in. Brian recommended the Area Assistant and Patrol Superintendent. • People would probably prefer to spend time on their own roads. • Decision: Ratings Team of two (Area Assistant and Patrol Superintendent) will rate their own roads, with a quality assurance check by a team that includes one person from Central Office.
Decision on pilot location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication needs around this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-2 page summary definition to describe the pilot to districts and counties. • As much information out to counties as possible to get participation and buy-in. A total commitment to keep counties informed, to work in partnership with them. A letter going out to all County Commissioners describing the program, explaining the pilot and why it's being done. The letter should also state the District SP & O Chief may be contacting the County about participating in this pilot, looking for one County per District. • Let counties know this is a different way of doing business, that it should not be perceived as something "above and beyond" what is currently being done. • We are asking for a change so we should be asking for those who are ready to step forward. • The first step in recruiting counties is getting criteria established. • The pilot is about flushing out problems and getting buy-in, so it really is best to have each District participate, to be aware of what's happening and able to bring up concerns early in the process.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot needs to provide time estimates to put a component in the Resource Model; estimate of training time, rating time, ratings review and evaluation times. • Possible criteria: three rural counties, three urban areas (>50,000); include Milwaukee County due to unique features; counties with a lot of growth (e.g. St. Croix or Brown Co.); and a county with a large portion of Interstate (I-94 corridor). Need to have a variety of road types, concerns, etc. • Decision: one county per district to be selected by SPO Managers. • Decision: Joe will send a note to the SPO Chiefs and Alison will send a letter to the County Commissioners prior to the Operations Managers Meeting on August 8; at that meeting, the Operations Managers will make the decision on the 8 counties to participate in the pilot. • Decision: criteria include: 2 large urban counties, 2 small urban counties, 3 rural counties, and Milwaukee County.
<p>THE RESULTS</p>	
Recommendations to Standards Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision: Recommend the use of state activity codes, since counties are familiar with them and we can use them to track cost data. • Features should be those of concern to the public. The Standards Team should look at the PASER manual and other states' experience when selecting features.
Communications Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above, letter to county commissioners written by Alison from the Advisory Team. • Need to ensure top management support, including from DTD, and alignment with Strategic Plan. • Decision: Dave Vieth should meet with Dan Pritchard and Lynne Judd and management team ASAP to update them on the pilot. [Note: Since Dave was out of town and the matter was urgent, Alison, John and Scott met with the team and got DTD commitment to the pilot.] • After Joe sends letter to SPO Managers, there should be an update letter sent to them from the Advisory team detailing this meeting. [Note: This did not happen, but they were updated on the meeting and its results.] • Main Themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the improved way of doing business • Help in priority identification • Accountability/Credibility • Purpose of the pilot is testing process, not program • Help set priorities • Links dollars to road conditions • May be a way of getting increased funding
Resource identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to figure out how long it will take to collect data and how much it will cost. An estimate is two weeks (80 hours) will be spent doing data collection in place of other tasks, but we need to get a handle on costs and resources so they can be integrated into Resource Model. [Note: the group finally agreed to an estimate of 8 days, including training, rating, debriefing meeting and QA visit.]
Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented by Tim Nachreiner and Alison Lebwohl • Sample reports from MAP and Caltrans were distributed. • As a manager, what questions should reports answer and how. • We can have some pre-set reports to get basic information. • It's important to make reports as easy and readable as possible. • We may want all backbone routes separated since they should be watched more closely. • The Team needs to develop a list of other data systems we might want Compass to interact with, including: SIMS/Sign View, Pontis (Bridge), Pavement Marking, LOS, CHEMS, Resource Model, Pavement Rating (PDI) System.
Future meetings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Late July or early August Conference Call, if necessary (choose two possible dates); 2. After initial road ratings, figure out if we have the right information or need more/different information; have reports available and include representatives from Standards and Ratings Teams; 3. Final meeting in November or December to finalize, wrap up, and set up final roll-out of Compass program for next year.